



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,150	09/05/2000	Motoki Kobayashi	450101-02197	6966
20999	7590	10/18/2005		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			EXAMINER MANNING, JOHN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/601,150	KOBAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Manning	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-15 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-15 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed July 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant asserts, "Hatori discloses that the display size of data icon is reduced toward the center of a spiral 104. Thus, the display size of the data icon is reduced toward the center of the spiral 104, but the sizes of the plurality of the images at the same distances from the center are the same". The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant assertion. Hatori discloses displaying icons representing image data where the icons are arranged spirally. A spiral is a curve which turns around some central point or axis, getting progressively closer to or farther from it, depending on which way one follows the curve. A two-dimensional spiral may be described using polar coordinates by saying that the radius r is a continuous monotonic function of θ . Given that the radius r is a continuous monotonic function of θ , any two icons (with a Non-equal θ) cannot, by definition, be the same distance from the central point or axis.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hatori discloses

Art Unit: 2614

a display window on a display screen, which displays icons representing image data.

An icon is merely a picture or symbol representing an object, task, command or choice

a user can select. Oosterhout discloses a selectable display item (i.e. an icon), that

represents a program (i.e. image data), that when selected by the user retrieves the

program. Yeo discloses time-indexed images (i.e. an icon) that represent past or future

portions of a video (i.e. image data).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification offers no support of the newly added limitation of "wherein one or more of the images are modified relative to **the** displayed image". For the sake of examination, the Examiner will assume that the aforementioned recited limitation is relevant to the recited focus setting means.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 10 recite the limitation "**the** displayed image" in "wherein one or more of the images are modified relative to **the** displayed image". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatori et al. (US Pat No 5,977,974) in view of Oosterhout et al (US Pat No 6,405,371) and further in view of Yeo et al. (US Pat No 6,219,837).

In regard to claim 1 and 10, Hatori et al. discloses an apparatus and method of generating images, which are sequential and arranged spirally. The input means of the system is input/output interface for the file system. The input means is the "disk input/output (I/O) interface for the file system 508 to read and write from/to the harddisk 515. Note, the disk I/O interface (I/F) 514 may be configured so as to be connected to a floppy disk drive and/or to a CD-ROM drive" (Col 4, Lines 37-43). The images are

Art Unit: 2614

generated such that the image at the second time point is larger than an image at the first time point. The system include image display means, display 302, for displaying the generated images. The image display means is a local process; therefore it is independent of the input data. "In FIG. 4, reference numeral 101 denotes a display window displayed on the display 302; 102, 103, 105a and 105b, data icons representing image data; and 104, a part of time axis rendered with curve, and called "spiral", hereinafter. On the spiral 104, data icons representing data which are sensed or generated at an earlier time than time assigned to the end point of the outermost curve of the spiral are arranged from the outside toward the inside of the spiral in descending order of time" (Col 5, Lines 18-26). Also, "the sizes of data icons representing respective data differ depending upon their displayed positions, and gradually decrease from the outermost wind to the inner winds of the spiral 104" (Col 5, Lines 56-60). Hatori discloses user selection of the displayed items. "When a data icon representing a desired data item is found from data icons currently displayed, by double-clicking a mouse on the data icon on the display screen, a corresponding data file is opened in another window" (Col 19, Lines 40-43). The selection means is a local process; therefore it is independent of the input data. However, Hatori fails to explicitly disclose "focus setting means for setting a focus on an image positioned at an area surrounded by the same, among the plurality of images displayed", "wherein one or more of the images are modified relative to the displayed image" or providing image data from one of a plurality of image data sources. The Oosterhout et al. reference teaches means for setting focus on a particular displayed sub-image so as to clearly identify to the user the

Art Unit: 2614

item to be selected (See Col 4, Lines 15-37). "In a step 303, the microprocessor receives cursor control commands from the remote control device and causes the graphics generator to display a cursor on screen. The cursor may take any convenient form. In FIG. 4, the cursor is shown as a framework around a selectable display item, such as a framework 45a around a sub-image or a framework 45b around an on-screen button. While moving the cursor across the sub-images on the mosaic screen with the cursor control keys (261 in FIG. 1), the receiver reproduces the audio signal of the associated television program" (Col 3, Lines 38-48). Also, "In a step 306, the control program determines which one of the selected display items is activated by the user. If a sub-image is activated, the television program associated therewith is selected for full-screen display" (Col 3, Lines 56-59). Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the Hatori et al. system with means for setting focus on a particular displayed sub-image (where focus may be achieved by distorting the other images relative to "focused image") so as to clearly identify to the user the item to be selected. Furthermore, Oosterhout teaches providing image data from one of a plurality of image data sources as can be see in Figure 2 so as to allow the user to navigate through television programs, where each channel is interpreted to be a image data source. The "microprocessor processes, in a step 307, the data which links the position of each sub-image in the mosaic signal MOS with the program number n of the associated television program TV-n, and applies the relevant program number to the demodulator and demultiplexer. The control program then returns to the step 301 to await a new EPG command" (Col 3, Lines 60-64). Consequently, it would have been

Art Unit: 2614

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the Hatori et al. system providing image data from one of a plurality of image data sources so as to allow the user to navigate through television programs. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose displaying a plurality of indexing images. The Yeo et al. reference teaches the use of indexing images or summary frames so as to provide quick hyperlinking to a past or future portion of the video. "These summary frames depict key scenes from the past which aid the viewer in quickly ascertaining the current plot or theme of the video program" (Col 3, Lines 28-31). Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the combined teaching with the use of indexing images or summary frames so as to provide quick hyperlinking to a past or future portion of the video.

In regard to claim 2 and 11, with respect to Hatori, the images are generated such that the image at the first time point is earlier than an image at the second time point. "On the spiral 104, data icons representing data which are sensed or generated at an earlier time than time assigned to the end point of the outermost curve of the spiral are arranged from the outside toward the inside of the spiral in descending order of time" (Col 5, Lines 18-26).

In regard to claim 3 and 12, the Oosterhout et al. reference discloses the fading of sub-images so as to accentuate the non-faded sub-images. "In an advantageous embodiment, the sub-images representing the desired program are distinguished from the others by reducing the visibility of the other sub-images. In this embodiment, the microprocessor causes the brightness mask generator (30 in FIG. 1) to generate a

Art Unit: 2614

brightness mask signal B which reduces the brightness of the displayed video signal in those screen areas where the sub-images of the non-desired television programs are displayed" (Col 4, Lines 21-28).

In regard to claim 4 and 13, the Oosterhout et al. reference discloses a frame of predetermined size responsive to the use input so as to indicate the user selection. "In a step 303, the microprocessor receives cursor control commands from the remote control device and causes the graphics generator to display a cursor on screen. The cursor may take any convenient form. In FIG. 4, the cursor is shown as a framework around a selectable display item, such as a framework 45a around a sub-image or a framework 45b around an on-screen button. While moving the cursor across the sub-images on the mosaic screen with the cursor control keys (261 in FIG. 1), the receiver reproduces the audio signal of the associated television program" (Col 3, Lines 38-48).

In regard to claims 5-6 and 14-15, the image data moves in both a radial and circumferential direction as defined by a spiral shown in Figure 4, Item 104. "In an advantageous embodiment, the sub-images representing the desired program are distinguished from the others by reducing the visibility of the other sub-images. In this embodiment, the microprocessor causes the brightness mask generator (30 in FIG. 1) to generate a brightness mask signal B which reduces the brightness of the displayed video signal in those screen areas where the sub-images of the non-desired television programs are displayed" (Col 4, Lines 21-28)

Claims 7 and 16 are met by that discussed above for claims 1 and 10.

Art Unit: 2614

In regard to claim 9 and 18, the Hatori et al. reference discloses information processing apparatus and method that displays image data in a spiral time axis. The reference fails to explicitly disclose the generation of a background image, which radially spreads from the center of the spiral. However, it is submitted that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Hatori et al. system with generation of a background image, which radially spreads from the center of the spiral so as give perspective in order to give the appearance of depth.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2614

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Manning whose telephone number is 571-272-7352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM
October 6, 2005



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600